

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

DAVID PUTZER,

Plaintiffs,

3:07-cv-0620-LRH-VPC

V.

ORDER

JAMES DONNELLY; et al.,

Defendants.

Before the court is plaintiff David Putzer’s (“Putzer”) objections to the magistrate judge’s September 28, 2009 order addressing various discovery and pre-trial motions (Doc. #192¹). Doc. #198.

Local Rule IB 3-1 authorizes a district judge to reconsider any pretrial matter referred to a magistrate judge pursuant to LR IB 1-3 where it has been shown that the magistrate judge's order is clearly erroneous or contrary to law. Here, Putzer objects to the magistrate's order (Doc. #192) arguing that the magistrate failed to consider his points and authorities filed in support of his motions and oppositions to the various motions addressed in the order.²

Initially, the court notes that although the order itself is brief, the magistrate heard argument

¹ Refers to the court's docket entry number.

² See Doc. ## 129, 130, 132, 133, 137, 146, 147, 149, 154, 158, 163, 166, 167, 168, 169, 174, 175, 188, 189 which were all addressed by the magistrate judge's September 28, 2009 order.

1 on the various motions on September 28, 2009. Thus, the court finds that Putzer's motion received
2 adequate attention and review from the magistrate judge and that his objection to the order's
3 brevity is therefore, without merit. Further, the magistrate's brevity is necessary in light of the
4 nineteen (19) separate motions addressed therein. The court is always conscious of the public's
5 interest in expeditious litigation and the court's own need to manage its docket. *See Ghazali v.*
6 *Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 52 (9th Cir. 1995).

7 Additionally, the court finds that Putzer has failed to show that the magistrate's order is
8 either contrary to law or clearly erroneous. Putzer simply re-alleges the arguments outlined in his
9 briefing. He does not point to any legal or factual error in the magistrate's order. Further, the
10 magistrate took his points and authorities into account before making a decision on the motions and
11 held a hearing on the motions for several hours to fully evaluate the parties' arguments and factual
12 support. Accordingly, the court shall affirm the magistrate judge's order.

13
14 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that plaintiff's objection to the magistrate judge's order
15 (Doc. #198) is DENIED.

16 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the magistrate judge's order denying various discovery
17 and pre-trial motions (Doc. #192) is AFFIRMED.

18 IT IS SO ORDERED.

19 DATED this 1st day of July 2010.



20
21
22 LARRY R. HICKS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
23
24
25
26